

## **COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE**

**February 6, 2006**

**6:15 PM**

Chairman Gatsas called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Gatsas, Shea, Garrity, Pinard, Duval

Messrs.: Virginia Lamberton, Fred Rusczek, Leo Bernier, Christine  
Martinsen

Chairman Gatsas advised that the first purpose of the meeting is organizational in nature, and requested the Clerk to provide a brief overview regarding typical issues addressed by the Committee

Clerk Normand stated issues typically addressed by the committee shall have jurisdiction over policy regarding the city's personnel system, the classification of personnel positions, the creation of new positions, and all policy pertaining to city risk management, self-insurance, insurance coverage's and such other matters as may be referred by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and after due and careful consideration, the committee shall report back to the full Board.

Chairman Gatsas addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, on behalf of Fred Rusczek, requesting reorganization of the management structure of the Health Department, the reclassification of two positions, the establishment of one full-time position and one part-time position.

Chairman Gatsas requested Fred Rusczek address the committee.

Mr. Fred Rusczek, Public Health Director, stated in order to see what makes the most sense for the Health Department for the long-term and for the short-term we looked at what we could do with our existing staff to continue to develop the capabilities of our staff and to use the skills that they have and then to figure out how we can backfill the work that will be displaced by pushing a Deputy's work onto the two new Public Health Administrator positions and in the process was able to come up with a little bit of a cost savings but cheaper in the long run than

trying to hire a Deputy. The challenge in trying to fill a Deputy position as it is is really two fold. One, today we're needed more and more 24/7 so it's great to have a little bit more depth but, secondly, folks like Rich DiPentima aren't readily available with that sort of background...he had a pretty broad background at least not here in New Hampshire. So, we have two highly competent staff that we want to continue to develop so they'd be ready to serve Manchester for a long time to come and still meet our needs. The half-time clerical position is a position that we had, we cut from the budget for budgetary reasons back, I believe, it was fiscal year 2002...what's happening is we're having more and more evening activities and we just can't spread our staff too thin for the evenings and certainly the department has grown quite a bit so the workload for the clerical staff is there and we don't really want to pay overtime for some of the evening duties. So, when Rich left we went to the drawing board and said what's the best we can do to keep the department services going, meet our needs and prepare for the future.

Alderman Shea stated what I want to know, Fred, is you said there's a cost savings in '06...how about the implication salary wise or cost savings in '07, '08 and so forth...how would this impact, if at all the restructuring of your department?

Mr. Rusczek replied the cost savings should continue, they should be the same.

Alderman Shea stated it's not a cost savings in '06 only but the implications would be in '07, '08...thank you.

Chairman Gatsas stated let's talk about the cost savings because what I'm reading here is that you're removing one position, putting in one full-time or two reclassifications, establishing one full-time and one part-time...can you give me the numbers directly on those positions and how you think you're going to save the funding.

Mr. Rusczek stated the numbers either directly involved...there is a sheet, the financial considerations...the cost, the upgrade, the two senior staff...currently in this year's budget the Deputy's position is budgeted with salaries and benefits at about \$111,000...the cost of the upgrades is about \$21,400, the Public Health Specialist position that we're looking to create to pick up some of the work pushed down by the additional duties assigned to the Public Health Administrator position is a lower paid position where the cost for salary and benefits is about \$57,000. The half-time Customer Service Rep cost is about \$23,000.

Chairman Gatsas stated so you're telling me that the salary and benefits of the Deputy position...what was the salary and what were the benefits.

Mr. Rusczek replied the salary...was a page grade 25 position...the salary was \$89,254...I'm looking at fiscal year '07 now I'm afraid that's all I have in front of me and benefits for fiscal year '07 were shown as \$28,158 for a total cost for fiscal year '07 of \$117,000.

Chairman Gatsas stated so if the Public Health Specialist II that you have in there is a family and I don't know I guess you're just basing these on percentages, is the percentage still 35% or higher.

Ms. Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, replied we just average it because sometimes you end up with a single plan, sometimes a family plan...whenever you're proposing a new position you just do an average...you average numbers for benefits which is 35%.

Chairman Gatsas stated when we talk about the \$28,000 those aren't actual costs...it would be 28% plus whatever the family cost would be so that \$111,000 isn't a reflective number.

Ms. Lamberton stated \$111,000 I think was the number that was the cost from the former incumbent who left.

Chairman Gatsas asked was the \$89,000...the 35% benefit cost?

Ms. Lamberton replied I'm not seeing \$89,000.

Chairman Gatsas stated that's what he just gave us and he said \$28,000 for benefits.

Mr. Rusczek stated the difference is the higher level position...the benefits like health insurance which are the same across the payroll spectrum don't take up as large of a percentage but when we look at the lower level positions the positions down in the 40's the benefits have traditionally been around 35% so those two offsets are reasonable ballpark...we've got a lot of employees who don't take health insurance for some reason.

Chairman Gatsas stated okay let's try this again, Fred. If his salary was \$89,000 what's his actual benefits if it was a family because that's the number we're looking at on the top because if that changes to \$103,000 then the savings on the bottom line goes away.

Ms. Lamberton asked may I answer that?

Chairman Gatsas replied sure.

Ms. Lamberton stated if he had taken the family plan it would be about \$12,000 more, a little bit more than \$12,000...almost \$12,000 for a family plan.

Chairman Gatsas stated so the savings goes from \$18,000 to \$30,000 on actual dollars.

Ms. Lamberton stated you're losing me.

Chairman Gatsas stated I guess because we use percentages and those percentages are only in calculation of benefits and that's probably the worse way that anybody can learn to run their department from an efficiency point of view and what we need to do is start inputting actual costs in the departments so they understand it.

Ms. Lamberton stated we do do that when we're doing budget projections but when they come to you with a proposed new position we average it because we do not know if who we hire is going to be a family plan, two-person or single.

Chairman Gatsas stated so my question is was the person that was in this position a family or a single.

Ms. Lamberton replied I think he probably was a two-person based on his age.

Mr. Rusczek stated he was in the system as being in Blue Cross Blue Shield at a cost of \$12,749.

Ms. Lamberton stated that would have been a family plan.

Chairman Gatsas stated so the \$28,000 I guess is my question...is that a cost or not a cost?

Ms. Lamberton replied it probably includes things like dental insurance, retirement, social security...when we add benefits it's not just the health and dental insurance.

Mr. Rusczek stated the \$28,000 includes retirement, disability, health, dental, medicare, social security, life and long-term life insurance.

Chairman Gatsas asked have you talked to the Mayor about this seeing that he is in his budget process?

Mr. Rusczek replied I have talked to the Mayor and I talked with Sean (Thomas) earlier and I'm not sure if either of them are here but I understand that they understand the need for this continuing. Sean said there was one minor question the Mayor wanted to ask me but as I understand it didn't have a concern with the organization.

Chairman Gatsas asked did he say that we should be approving this some three months before a budget process or is there a reason why we're looking at new employees when we're three months from getting to a budget process...actually, less than that I guess.

Ms. Lamberton interjected may I just help out here a little bit.

Chairman Gatsas replied sure.

Ms. Lamberton stated apparently if you look in the letter there's two positions being reclassified upward to substitute for one Deputy...there will be new people there...they're already there...then you'll have the new Health Specialist II so there will be one new employee there and then a half of an employee as a Customer Service Rep...so, it's just 1.5 more people...the money for that will come from the money that's left over from not filling the Deputy position.

Chairman Gatsas asked has any of the Deputy position come from Homeland Security money...any payment of that Deputy?

Mr. Rusczek replied no...we don't get Homeland Security money...we get Public Health Preparedness and Bioterrorism money and of the other two...the two Public Health Administrators a portion of that comes from that outside money... 15% for each. The Deputy position was our position who had the primary responsibility among other things but to do all of the Flu Pandemic planning so these are critical needs to continue on.

Chairman Gatsas stated I kind of look at this saying why are we creating new positions when the Mayor is in his budget process and these things should be accommodated in that budget process when we have discussions for the whole city because if we start doing it now we're going to see every department come before us or as normal they come two months after we put the budget in place in July, August or September for a new position and I kind of question why it's not in the budget process.

Ms. Lamberton stated from an HR perspective it would be very troubling if through the budget process you started to reclassify jobs because it would be unlikely that there would be any analysis or anything that would be done properly and so you wouldn't understand or know what the impact would be on other classifications or other positions around the city. Currently, talking about new positions is a whole different subject matter but I would really highly advise the Board never to reclassify jobs through the budget process that would just really mess up the system.

Chairman Gatsas stated so if I understand what you're saying...your recommendation would be to upgrade the two people and lease the new two positions open until we get to the budget process.

Ms. Lamberton stated that would be your decision but it would be my preference.

Alderman Shea stated if we didn't fill these positions the way that you're asking us to what would be the implication at the Health Department, in your opinion.

Mr. Rusczek stated essentially what you're doing is you're taking out one of our key senior management who is responsible to respond 24/7. The other two could not pick up the duties nor could I pick up the displaced duties of a deputy without that additional support at the lower level position.

Alderman Shea stated again what would happen if that were not done.

Mr. Rusczek stated certainly we won't be able to participate in Flu Pandemic planning, we won't be able to respond 24/7 in all cases and to deal with things... we're also facing a tremendous increase in so many other public health issues. This year we're going to...by the end of the year been involved in the investigation of about 300 communicable diseases...just four or five years ago that number was between 60 and 75 cases per year and there are so many issues that are coming up all the time and certainly the Flue Pandemic planning and working with the community are critical issues. So, we will have...if something happens we will have tremendous issues, tremendous challenges trying to meet them and I don't believe we're going to be able to. Even this weekend I know that Rich DiPentima was receiving calls because folks didn't know he had retired and how many were referred onto me...the nature of our business is we're a small department in a small community and the only way we could staff the 24/7 because shifts don't make any sense for our size department is to keep people going 24/7.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the recommendation of the Human Resources Director as submitted by the Public Health Director.

Chairman Gatsas stated I will not accept that motion...I'll leave it open for discussion because I have some other questions and I guess my questions are...the two people for \$21,000 that you're telling me...they go up to what salary grades because I don't see them on here.

Mr. Rusczek replied the two would go to salary grade 24.

Chairman Gatsas asked how much...from what to what?

Mr. Rusczek replied one is going from 23 to 24 and the other would be going from 21 to 24.

Chairman Gatsas asked how much are those salary increases?

Ms. Lamberton asked do you know their steps by any chance?

Mr. Rusczek replied I don't have their steps in front of me.

Ms. Lamberton stated how about if I pick a step in the middle. So, salary grade 21, step 6 is \$55,112...that incumbent would probably go to about \$60,000.

Chairman Gatsas stated and the other one.

Ms. Lamberton stated did you say he was a 23 now.

Mr. Rusczek stated I know they're higher up in their salary range.

Ms. Lamberton stated we're just doing the middle step here to demonstrate...if he's a step 6...actually, I don't think he is...I think he's lower than that but let's just say he was...his current salary would be \$63,098, so in 24 he would go to probably step 8 about \$71,600...I did look up that salary for some reason and I believe he's at the lower end of the current salary.

Chairman Gatsas stated so it's an \$8,000 raise for somebody and the other \$21,000...another \$8,000.

Ms. Lamberton stated no what the ordinance says...what you do is you look at the person's current salary grade and so in this instance if we use step 6 it would be \$63,098...so what the ordinance says if you look to see if that person stayed in that grade what would their salary be...it would be \$64,991 and you look to see in the new grade which is 24 what gives them at least \$64,991 and you see that five does which actually is \$65,548, so I was applying the promotional rules earlier which I shouldn't have been...it's about 3% is what it comes down to.

Chairman Gatsas stated let me just start by...just so that you know that for the next time for this Chair if you can get those so that we understand them when we see them before us.

Ms. Lamberton stated sure, fine I'd be happy to.

Chairman Gatsas asked what happens to the other \$13,000 that in play somewhere because it's not in raises? I'm looking at a cost that you're showing me here of \$21,000.

Mr. Rusczek stated when I did the calculations that's what I came up with with the additional benefits.

Ms. Lamberton interjected he probably...unfortunately a lot of people don't realize that we have a separate ordinance for reclassifications. There are a lot of people who use the promotional ordinance which guarantees the incumbent a 10% increase which we changed a couple of years ago and so that might be what you did, Fred, you might have used the promotional ordinance which again most people do that...we usually end up correcting them. I had to correct myself a few minutes ago, so that happens.

Mr. Rusczek stated I think you're right.

Ms. Lamberton stated the net savings here are greater than what Fred is saying by probably 12%, at least.

Chairman Gatsas stated so Fred are you telling me that when the person that you had in place before was able to accommodate everything that was happening in that department and his duties and now because you've elevated two people to positions that are comparable that you need somebody else in that department...one-and-a-half more people to carry on the weight.



Mr. Rusczek stated they have two full-time jobs now and they're very busy, active people and these are folks that routinely work past 40 hours...both were chosen for the Top 40, Under 40 candidates...Tim Soucy two years ago and Anna Thomas this year...they're just tremendous professionals and committed to this community and they're working over 40 hours now...I get as many e-mails from them on weekends as I probably do for other reasons. They don't have the capacity to pick up that additional work of a deputy who is also working at a greater level without some back filling someplace.

Chairman Gatsas stated I would think that this committee would move forward with moving the two staff people to the two upgrades but I think we would hold new positions and new hires until we get to the budget process. I think we should be looking at the entire city and not just piecemealing this out with people per department when the Mayor's coming in with a budget and we're looking at the same budget restraints in the next few months...elevating the two people I probably don't have a problem with that...hiring a new person and a part-time employee I certainly have a problem with that. What is the choice of the board?

Alderman Shea asked...Fred, what is the implication of going along with the Chairman's suggestion...what will happen that you foresee perhaps happening if you don't get additional...

Mr. Rusczek replied if that happens we're losing a senior management level position that is critical to our public health work. As I said Rich DiPentima role was to do everything from Avian Flu planning to oversee all the federal money we get, to handle some of that stuff and to fill in in many places and if we lose...we're essentially losing what is a full-time position that is at the top range of the scale. To ask the other two to pick up that duty which is essentially saying pick up 50% of his duties without providing some backfill below to pick up the duties that are displaced they really don't have the capacity to do that.

Alderman Shea stated I guess there are two different segments here...there's a new position here which is a .5 FTE Customer Service Rep and then the other one is the Public Health Specialist II, so you indicated the Public Health Specialist II but how about the other person.

Mr. Rusczek stated the other position is because we have such a great growth in so many of our areas...we have additional evening work and clinics and we had that position. We haven't had the capacity in our budget to pick it up in the past. We have had that position...with everything that we have going on it just makes sense to improve the efficiencies by adding that person at this time. What we're trying to do is we went into this to try to maximize what we could do with the resources there for public health.

Alderman Duval stated to take off from what Alderman Shea asked you...I think when you refer to senior management positions you were not referring to the Public Health Specialist II you were talking about the void left by the retirement of your second man. But the void left by your deputy is being filled by the two positions that you're elevating.

Mr. Rusczek stated correct.

Alderman Duval stated the Public Health Specialist you think is a need and this was a way to creatively put a fix to that need without requesting more funding.

Mr. Rusczek stated if we're pushing the work of the deputy onto two Public Health Administrators who are working at full capacity now then they need to push work someplace else and so that was going to be the Public Health Specialist...they would be able to down load some of their work and the other added benefit is it keeps public health growing from the lower level instead of going out and trying to hire a deputy.

Alderman Duval stated I'm just curious. How did this come about, Fred? Was this sort of creative thinking on your department's part, was it a collaboration with people within your department in terms of how to approach this without requesting additional funding for the next budget?

Mr. Rusczek replied we looked, as a department, and certainly I have the prime responsibility to say what do we do when a deputy retires. What do we want to do, what do we want to do to make certain that the services can continue and that we can continue to develop staff so that we have somewhat of a succession plan so people know what to do in the event that we're needed 24/7. You can take and move someone in to pick up any public health duties and the only way to try and create that capacity within our current staff was then to try and find a way to say okay let's...we've got to backfill the work that is displaced by the people who'll be taking on more so we tried to push it down to a lower level...you can either evolve the department and make certain that there are people that are ready and competent to be to respond.

Chairman Gatsas asked what would be a starting position of a new deputy?

Ms. Lamberton replied most likely you'd be hiring from within and so remember whatever their grade is they're going to get a minimum of a 10% increase, so they're not going to start at the minimum of salary grade 25 but I'll tell you what that salary is...that's \$62,315 and it maxes out at \$88,847.

Chairman Gatsas stated so what you're saying is that one of the people that we're looking to elevate as parody of the two we can bring in at \$68,000 which is about a \$22,000 reduction from the top salary that was there and we're adding that third person because then they could fill the Public Health Administrator along the same lines and that would take up for your Health Specialist and your part-time person and probably even save more money.

Ms. Lamberton stated correct.

Chairman Gatsas stated that would save even more money without adding that full-time and part-time.

Ms. Lamberton stated obviously it would save more money because you wouldn't have the new positions but I think you have to think organizationally what he's trying to accomplish here. I'm sure you understand that people...

Chairman Gatsas stated I understand what he's trying to create organizationally but to tell me that a Health Specialist is going to pick up the slack of the two people in between.

Ms. Lamberton stated I think one of the ways that would maybe help Fred out would be if you'd turn a couple of pages back in your attachments and you'll see that the position that we're changing from Public Health Preparedness Administrator to Public Health Administrator and that was the Tim Soucy classification. The other employee is a Public Health Specialist III, I believe. But, if you start to walk through that and correct me if I'm wrong, Fred, but you'll see that a line has been put through certain parts of the duties that were assigned to that position which I am going to assume in part are going to be delegated downward to a lower level employee to do more hands on type of work at the Public Health Specialist II level.

Chairman Gatsas stated that's why my conversation with the Mayor was that it looks like you could do what you wanted to do and elevate those two people, get a Deputy Director in place and it would save you more money.

Alderman Shea stated I'm a little bit confused. Let's assume that there's someone in your department that you push up to Deputy Director who would then take the person who's pushed up and how would you attempt to replace that person?

Mr. Rusczyk replied we'd be in the same boat...the deputy would have to be making an increment higher than the...

Alderman Shea stated then you'd have to replace that person with someone else wouldn't you...I don't know...I'm just saying.

Ms. Lamberton stated it would be promotionals. Somebody would be promoted to Deputy, whatever position that person vacated would be posted and someone would be promoted to that, etc, etc., etc.

Alderman Shea stated eventually there would be somebody having to be replaced...I don't know where that would be whether it would be in the middle tier or the bottom tier or wherever but it doesn't seem to me that you would save much when you shake it out...I don't know if you'd save anything at all maybe you would but you wouldn't have the same kind of situation you're comfortable with as the Director of Health.

Mr. Rusczek stated we wouldn't have the depth. The other thing to keep in mind is that the Deputy position would have to be...is it 10% higher than...

Ms. Lamberton replied no...people think that but there's no ordinance for that.

Mr. Rusczek stated some of us have been around for so long we remember the old days.

Alderman Duval stated just so I'm clear on this...just bear with me. So the addition of...I'm not going to focus so much on the part-time position but let's talk about the Public Health Specialist II...the creation of that position, was it in large part driven by a critical need of the department absent the retirement of the Deputy or was it the retirement of the Deputy that sort of prompted you to look at alternative means to address the workload.

Mr. Rusczek replied the retirement of the Deputy is what triggered that. We wouldn't have been looking for a Public Health Specialist II other than with the retirement we need to push work down.

Alderman Duval stated you figured this was the most cost efficient manner to do it.

Ms. Lamberton stated I think too if you look at the organizational charts...the current one and the proposed one you'll see structurally it's much smoother and it's clearer who's responsible for what than the current chart.

Chairman Gatsas stated all I'm saying is that if we're talking about promoting from within, you can create a Deputy Director for about \$68,000, you can give the two people that are parallel those raises that you're taking about, eliminating... because now you've done what you were looking to do, you would eliminate the Public Health Specialist and the part-time employee. You're going to be getting into it and saving \$57,000 because Mr. Rusczek was concerned about not distribution of wages...I'm saying that you've got a reduction in there...you're increasing costs to that department by \$57,000 at least.

Ms. Lamberton stated may I ask a question...are you saying to fill the Deputy Director position and then to reclassify the other two positions?

Chairman Gatsas replied that's correct.

Ms. Lamberton stated I would then disagree with you because the only reason I'm recommending that they be reclassified is because presumably they're going to be assuming higher level duties and responsibilities which would end back on their salary grades. If they don't assume those duties and responsibilities they shouldn't get reclassified.

Chairman Gatsas stated then I would take your opinion that we wouldn't reclassify and put a Deputy Director in and at that point you'd be saving even more money.

Mr. Rusczek stated there aren't deputy directors out there right now. There's been such a push to hire people around this country...we've watched communities like Nashua that pays an equal level deputy level and they're not there, it's nice to be in a position where there is a great demand right now but it's very hard to be looking to hire someone when we just don't have the folks out there who would be...

Chairman Gatsas interjected you were just talking about hiring from within. Are you telling us that one of these people that you're looking to put in these reclassifications wouldn't make a good Deputy Director.

Mr. Rusczek stated the two individuals are exceptional individuals and they probably would make very good deputies in most places. There are things that are coming up through that there's still things to learn and develop and the handling of all of the federal funds and to handling a lot of the work that we do has not been something that we've developed and yet this is the opportunity to continue the growth and develop staff for the future and meet our needs.

Chairman Gatsas stated go ahead, what's the wish of the board?

Alderman Garrity stated I have a hard time approving something like this right before the budget season. When you have somebody going from a salary grade 21 to a 24 and then a 23 to a 24...we're less than 90 days away from budget season and I can't in good conscience approve something this close to the budget season.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the Health Department's request...the savings are at least \$8,675.00 plus more money than he says. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Gatsas voted nay, the motion failed.

Chairman Gatsas asked do I have another motion? Open for discussion.

Alderman Duval stated a question of Mr. Rusczek. Fred, along the lines of what Alderman Gatsas was inquiring about if you maintain the position of Deputy and the current structure that exists now and you can do it in effect for less than what you're proposing does that work for you?

Mr. Rusczek replied I think that there's two challenges there. One of them is I don't think it would be less money and secondly we're not going to be able to find someone who could walk in...the people out there are not there.

Chairman Gatsas stated you just told me that one of these two people would qualify as a Deputy Director.

Mr. Rusczek stated I said in most health departments. I said there are still some things that we need to handle from all of the federal funded projects.

Chairman Gatsas stated Fred you're telling me one thing and then in the next breadth you're telling me you're distributing all these other things that came from the Deputy Director down to them.

Mr. Rusczek stated we will work with them to continue to develop them, dividing up the load and we're going to move them ahead.

Alderman Duval stated let's assume these two people share the responsibility of the Deputy...those responsibilities and obligations that position brings will be divvied up between these two individuals presumably...at some time do you plan on addressing that and promoting one to Deputy again or recreating that position, is that in the foreseeable future?

Mr. Rusczek replied I won't during my tenure. Down the road what happens I don't know, for me it's an ideal world to have a Deputy where I can walk away and someone takes care of everything and down the road another department head may find the same thing. For me, I don't foresee that coming because I know that we've got budget issues.

Chairman Gatsas asked do I have a motion to table?

Alderman Duval moved to table item 4. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Shea duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Gatsas addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, recommending updates for class specifications in the Planning and Community Development Department as enclosed herein.

Alderman Garrity moved for discussion. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Alderman Garrity asked Ginny there's no fiscal impact?

Ms. Lamberton replied no actually it's saving money by keeping job class specifications up-to-date so that five years from now you won't have to pay a million dollars to have somebody else do it.

Chairman Gatsas asked do I have a motion?

Alderman Pinard moved to approve the recommended updates for class specifications in the Planning and Community Development Department. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated Ginny you did send me a letter to this regard.

Ms. Lamberton replied yes I did.

Alderman Shea stated I would like to read it into the record regarding items 5 and 6 if I may:

Dear Alderman Shea:

You left a message for me inquiring as to what, if any, would be the fiscal note for items 5 and 6 on the Human Resources and Insurance Committee agenda.

As you will note on my cover letters for these items, we are just updating the class specifications to keep them contemporary and meaningful. There are no requests for reclassifications in either of the packages.

I will be submitting additional class specifications from the remaining departments in the upcoming months. The purpose to those is the same as the two items before the Committee now. However, if during the updating process it appears that the duties are not consistent with the basic purpose to the class specifications or consistent with the salary grade that is assigned to a position, we will request that the incumbent(s) complete position questionnaires to verify the duties and determine whether or not the position is properly classified.

At this point, there is no fiscal impact to the two items that are before you. I hope this answers your questions. If not, please let me know and I will be happy to respond further.

Sincerely,  
s/Virginia A. Lamberton  
Human Resources Director

Alderman Shea stated I appreciate your correspondence to me in regard to this, Ginny.

Chairman Gatsas called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, recommending updates for class specifications in the Water Works Department as enclosed herein.



Alderman Shea moved for discussion. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Ms. Lamberton stated since I wrote this letter and it was sent to the City Clerk's office Tom Bowen asked me to change this one thing on the WTP Chief Operator class specification.

Chairman Gatsas asked do I have a motion?

Alderman Duval moved to approve the recommended updates for class specifications in the Water Works Department. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas asked Ms. Lamberton for item 4 relating to the Health Department request could you do two work ups so that we see them one that we would put in a new Deputy Director and what that salary range would start at...putting those two people in their flow charts as they are, what that is and a price work up.

Ms. Lamberton stated you mean if it was one or the other of those two people.

Chairman Gatsas stated it doesn't matter if we started somebody and just upgraded those two people at the levels we were talking about in today's situation and not putting in the part-time and the full-time specialist.

Alderman Duval stated I hold Mr. Rusczyk in the highest regard...I'm just concerned, I just want to make sure that the efficiencies that he's proposing we are indeed going to experience and that was the reason for the line of question. If indeed a department has worked diligently on trying to come up with ways to run their department more efficiently then I think we should applaud their efforts and I respect the questions asked by Alderman Shea as well and I just want to make sure that if indeed it results in a savings then we experience those savings.

Chairman Gatsas addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Communication from Leo Bernier, City Clerk, seeking recommendation to the full Board that the position of City Clerk be established at a Salary Grade 27, effective December 6, 2005.

Alderman Garrity moved to receive and file. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Gatsas stated I will not accept the motion. I will accept a motion for discussion and then you can move to receive and file.

Alderman Garrity moved for discussion. Alderman Duval duly seconded the motion for discussion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas stated I believe someone is going to make a presentation to this committee so that we...I'm sure that some of the members had the opportunity to hear it last time and we have two new members so I think that we should afford them at least the ability to hear what's coming before us.

Alderman Duval stated thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. Mr. Chairman, the information we're getting now is that in addition to what we received in our packet already?

Ms. Christine Martinsen, Human Resource Analyst, replied it's the same material that's in your packet except I just organized it a little bit different so that it would be more understandable.

Chairman Gatsas asked how long have you been a Human Resource Analyst?

Ms. Martinsen replied I've been in the department for ten years and basically my duties continue to evolve with every Director. I have been doing classifications since Yarger Decker and I was trained under Yarger Decker for classifications... I've been doing it since that time.

Chairman Gatsas asked in your tenure how many classifications have you done?

Ms. Martinsen replied many.

Chairman Gatsas stated 100, 200.

Ms. Martinsen stated I really can't say, I don't know.

Chairman Gatsas stated within 20%.

Ms. Martinsen stated let me put it this way. When Yarger Decker left I was the main person doing classifications. When Ginny gave we've been splitting the classifications. So, she's been doing some and I've been doing some. It's been all along it hasn't really stopped. Some of them come up almost every session...there's some change...either I've done it or Ginny has done it and that's the way it's been.

Chairman Gatsas asked what is your position on the classification that's before us so that we get a tone for what you're going to be presenting to us.

Ms. Martinsen stated when a review is requested I do the review of the position, I do the factor points of the position and the grade for the position. So, the whole gamut.

Chairman Gatsas asked what is the wish of this committee, do you want to hear a full presentation from her or do you want to go to questions and answers for you folks who have not heard this material before, would you like to hear it directly from her?

Alderman Pinard replied a full discussion with everybody.

Chairman Gatsas stated I'm just asking whether you want to get into a total presentation that she may give us so that you get a flavor from what we're going to hear and then get into a discussion. Why don't you give us a full presentation and then we can go from there.

Ms. Martinsen stated I did a historical review of the position. When I reviewed the position I noticed that I had a few more points than Yarger Decker had on the position when he first reviewed the position. I wasn't quite sure what the difference was in the numbers so I went back and did a historical review to find out why were my numbers a little bit different than Decker's numbers and this what I found out. I went back into the records and I noticed that on January 13, 1999 there was a letter from Mark Hobson the Human Resources Director at the time to the members of the Yarger Decker Appeals Board. At that time, as you know, positions were...there were appeals put in for positions that Yarger Decker had reviewed...this particular position was put in for a review. At the time of the review Yarger Decker recommended denial of the appeal with the following exception. They indicated that the position should move to an A level if it achieves national clerk...if the City Clerk achieves a National Clerk Certification. There is also a caveat in there that says "or position changes significantly due to additional duties caused by City Hall Complex management." Once this appeal was entered the next thing that happened on March 1, 1999 an Archives and Records Management office was developed and the City Clerk became responsible for supervising that office. The office now has two locations due to growth. Then there was an ordinance dated April 20, 1999 and here is where the Mayor and Board of Aldermen approved policies and procedures for the use of the public areas and facilities maintenance of the City Hall Complex. So what they did was to give responsibility for the City Hall Complex to the Public Works Director and the City Clerk who was to oversee the repair, maintenance, capital improvements, operation and cleaning of the City Hall Complex. So, if you see initially his

appeal was denied so that if he is going to take charge or is in control of the City Hall Complex then it does significantly change the additional duties that Yarger Decker mentions in the appeals process. Now, in June 1999 the City Clerk's office became responsible for contracted security guards. On January 1, 2001, a security guard unit was established when contract security employees became city employees and the supervision of this unit fall under the City Clerk's office. So, now we have the City Clerk also being responsible for a security guard at both here and at the Library. So, in conclusion, since the Yarger Decker appeal responsibility for the City Clerk's position has changed in a couple of different ways. First, an Archives and Records Management office was developed and it has expanded to two sites...the City Clerk is responsible for that office. Secondly, the City Clerk's office is now responsible for a security guard unit. Note that the City Clerk's position at the time was...he was only one point away from a Grade 27 and that's fairly unusual, he was I think 800 points, he needed 801 to become a Grade 27. So, even just looking at the security unit which is really completely different from the responsibilities that he has as a City Clerk he's responsible now for this one group that also has to do the security around the building...that could have easily been considered a unit and he would have been given at least five points under the Yarger Decker plan. So, then finally, the City Clerk's position...the ordinance itself gave the management responsibilities to the City Clerk's office. So, if I go back to Yarger Decker and what they said in their appeal I see that the position has changed and with...actually, Decker even said that if the position changed in that respect that he should be due another grade and I did actually when I first did this I didn't know the reason for the discrepancy. Now, if we look in the package that I gave you I have a copy of the Director Mark Hobson's letter to the Appeals Board that indicates that if he achieves the Clerk Certification he would move to an A step and it would be a grade if the position changed significantly to additional duties caused by the City Hall Complex management. The next letter would be the ordinance that gives that responsibility to the City Clerk's position and basically this whole process started...there's another letter after the ordinance...the whole process started with a report by Carol Johnson to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen regarding the City Clerk's office request to explore combining certain functions of the parking department...that's how this all occurred, that's how I ended up going to the City Clerk's office to review what the impact would be if this occurred. So, I reviewed a number of positions...that was only one of the positions that I reviewed. And, finally, there's a letter that I originally sent to Carol Johnson in terms of my review of the position and the last letter is Carol Johnson's letter to Alderman Shea regarding the information that came about from the review.

Chairman Gatsas stated so let me understand that basically the request came to you and you did your review in September of 2004.

Ms. Martinsen stated yes I did.

Chairman Gatsas stated, however, the denial came five years before that.

Ms. Martinsen stated yes it did...there was a denial...the appeal denial was back in 1999, however, there were caveats to that appeal.

Chairman Gatsas stated correct and then from there from '99 to 2004 there were additional duties placed on the Clerk.

Ms. Martinsen stated yes there was.

Chairman Gatsas asked is there a reason why at that point from 1999 to 2004 he didn't come forward looking for a reclassification?

Ms. Martinsen replied I think it just fell through the cracks. He could have come...

Chairman Gatsas interjected that's probably not a question for your to answer so maybe I'll ask if of the Clerk if he has the ability to come forward. From now on my feeling is is that if someone is going to address the committee to address us from up there rather than behind us because I'd rather see your face when we ask you the question. Thank you.

City Clerk Bernier stated to answer your question I completely forgot about it.

Chairman Gatsas stated so you made an appeal in 1999.

City Clerk Bernier stated that's correct.

Chairman Gatsas stated you got additional duties.

City Clerk Bernier stated that's correct.

Chairman Gatsas stated and you forgot about it.

City Clerk Bernier stated that's correct.

Chairman Gatsas asked what brought it to your attention in 2004?

City Clerk Bernier replied when the Board of Mayor and Aldermen requested the City Clerk's office to review, to combine Ordinance Violations with the City

Clerk's office as well as some functions of the Traffic Department. In return I asked that all positions in our office that would be involved be looked at/reviewed.

Chairman Gatsas stated there were additional things that were added to your department from 1999 to 2004...did none of those refresh your memory that you should be looking for a compensation level step up.

City Clerk Bernier replied no. I completely forgot about it again until the Board of Mayor and Aldermen asked us to review and the agreement was that they'd look at the positions in the City Clerk's office...several positions.

Chairman Gatsas called upon Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea asked when the new two people had been added to your responsibilities has that increased the amount of hours you have to work?

City Clerk Bernier asked what two new people are your referring to?

Alderman Shea replied the people that she cited were added to your responsibilities.

City Clerk Bernier asked are you talking about security or archives, Sally?

Alderman Shea replied these are the people that have been added to your responsibilities, have they increased yours hours of operation?

City Clerk Bernier asked are you talking about the office or my hours that I work in the City Clerk's office? To answer your question when we don't have security guards I end up working that evening, that's correct. And, Sally, when she needs some advice to go after grants, I sign the grants...if you recall we have raised over, I think, \$16,000 through the moose plates and people I've talked to...I think that's an asset. So, to answer your question yes I am involved.

Alderman Shea asked how many departments in the city, Christine, have four deputy clerks?

Ms. Martinsen replied I don't think there are any others, however, I think the title...

Alderman Shea interjected so this is the only department in the city that has Mr. Bernier as City Clerk and then there are four Deputy City Clerks, is that correct?

Ms. Martinsen replied that's correct, however, I believe there's a reason why they're Deputy Clerks...I think there's something regarding their current position that their titles need to be that.

City Clerk Bernier stated because our activities in the City Clerk's office, by state statutes, there are documents that need to be signed and they need to be clerks and was established in 1999 through Yarger Decker.

Alderman Shea stated if in fact these four people that were given this responsibility...has that lessened your responsibilities in terms of their taking less work for you and adding more work for them because of their being deputies.

City Clerk Bernier stated as you are aware our office is very active and it's really a plus to have those deputies there.

Alderman Shea stated I'm not asking you that. I'm asking you that because these people have been promoted to different responsibilities within the City Clerk's office have they lessened the amount of responsibilities that you have been given or have because you have these four people that are now Deputy Clerks.

City Clerk Bernier stated we have, for example, Tricia (Piecuch) who is the Deputy Clerk for Elections...I work with her on a daily basis during elections.

Alderman Shea stated I'm just asking you...at one time there were not four Deputy Clerks...they weren't given these titles...because of the titles and the upgrades that they've been given because they have been reclassified has your work been diminished.

City Clerk Bernier replied no.

Alderman Shea stated none at all.

City Clerk Bernier replied no.

Alderman Shea asked has it increased?

City Clerk Bernier replied with the changes in state and federal laws yes.

Alderman Shea stated now the last question...Christine because people are hired...additional personnel are hired in different departments has that resulted in any department head being upgraded because they have assumed more employees...to your knowledge.

Ms. Martinsen replied no that is not the criteria here and that's not what we're judging this position for. It's not the number of people and it's not just the added responsibilities. He was given the responsibility for this Complex, he's got a security guard unit, which he didn't have before, he also has an Archives and Records Management office, which he didn't have before. Some of these functions are very different, they are considered a unit...we're not counting it as...in some respects when you first look at a classification the number of people that you supervise does come into play...we're not talking about that in this particular case. What we're talking about is the fact that he's got completely...for example, a completely separate unit that really has nothing to do with one of the functions of the City Clerk's office which is licensing...he's got security guards and that's a whole unit. Yarger Decker reviews that differently...he gets points for that.

Alderman Shea stated part of the problem that has arisen is the fact that because there have been additional people that have been employed here it raised the amount of points, so to speak, that he's been entitled to...that's what you've raised.

Ms. Martinsen stated what I'm raising is the fact that there is more responsibility because it's not only the people per se but he has separate units...he got credit for having a separate unit and that's what came in play plus the fact that he got responsibility for the City Hall Complex. He was only one point away from a grade. I don't see any other positions one point away from a grade, his was the only one...it's not hard to get a couple of points because he has a unit, he's supervising a separate unit.

Alderman Shea asked he supervises how many people?

Ms. Martinsen replied I believe there are 14 people in his office.

City Clerk Bernier stated that's correct.

Alderman Shea stated 14 people, four deputies and a city clerk...that's five people out of the 14 that are administrative positions, is that correct?

Ms. Martinsen replied yes.

Alderman Duval stated the reference in that memo from Mark Hobson from Human Resources...must have been the Human Resources Director at that time...the memo dated January 13, 1999 where he references position changes significantly due to additional duties caused by the City Hall Complex management...it must have been a simultaneous action going on at the time or



there must have been discussion relating to increased responsibility at the time the memo was written or the time that Yarger Decker was done.

Ms. Martinsen replied I can't answer that, I'm not sure. I just went through whatever records I saw and I noticed that at one point that did go through. The Mayor and Board of Aldermen did give him that responsibility several months later so it's quite possible.

Alderman Duval stated it could very well have been. Should this committee approve it or the Board of Aldermen ultimately approve it...I'm talking about the increase in grade change...do you see an increased opportunity, in your opinion, for department heads to seek similar increases or do you think this is an isolated case perhaps

Ms. Martinsen replied I don't know what can happen except I can tell you that when anyone...it doesn't matter whether it's department heads or an employee if there's been significant change in their position then we review the position and sometimes people think there's a significant change in the position just because they have more work and that's not the case. It's basically the level of work that they do and the function of what they do, it's not just oh, I've got more work so I'm going to request an increase...that's not the case. The position has to change significantly for us to review and change any step and grade so it would have to be different. For example, different from Yarger Decker...if my position for example...it's evolved but the responsibilities are comparable to what I'm receiving as a compensation but if they were to change more since Yarger Decker then I would go into the Human Resources Department and say hey look my positions' changed, I have a lot more responsibility, a higher level of responsibility and I feel that I need a review.

Alderman Duval stated I want to make sure we're clear on the historical chain of events so bear with me. The point that was made in Mark Hobson's memo I think is significant as to whether we ultimately approve or disapprove this request for change. The caveat and again I think it's a little ambiguous but there appears to be a caveat that is directly linked to something else going on in my view and since that memo in 1999 that Hobson wrote there have been in effect, in fact three additional responsibilities taken under the auspices or purview of the City Clerk...that would be security of this building, the maintenance of facilities relating to this building and records management. Prior to 1999 when this memo was written was there some other department or department head responsible for record management or was the city not doing that?

Ms. Martinsen stated I'm not sure I don't think the city was doing that back then.

City Clerk Bernier stated that's correct, it just evolved at that time through grants. We received a grant to look at our records and evolved under previous Mayor Wieczorek as a permanent position.

Alderman Duval stated and the same thing with security...was that under anybody else's purview prior to the establishment of it being put under the auspices of the City Clerk's office?

City Clerk Bernier replied it all evolved with the new complex when it opened up in 1999 there were some issues...the city has just made a \$7.3 million investment and we wanted to make sure it was protected which is when the security guards came into play.

Alderman Duval stated that has been since 1999.

City Clerk Bernier stated correct. If you'll notice there's an item tabled on your agenda regarding John Sysyn...his job functions have changed so much that we've also come to this committee asking for his review and support of the request.

Alderman Pinard stated if this goes through is there going to be an impact, as small as the amount is on taxes and then if there's a chain reaction with other departments wanting a raise...how is that going to affect this year's budget.

Chairman Gatsas stated I'm sure the Board will be jumping into it shortly. I think that we ought to just focus on what we have here because if you try and focus on what impacts are I can't give you that information as to whether other department heads will be coming forward. Let me ask a couple of other questions.

Alderman Shea asked may I ask a couple of questions.

Chairman Gatsas replied certainly.

Alderman Shea stated what I would like to ask is prior to the renovation of this particular facility who was responsible for the maintenance of this building?

City Clerk Bernier replied Building Maintenance Department.

Alderman Shea asked were you responsible for this building, the security and the maintenance?

City Clerk Bernier stated prior to the renovations and restoration of this building.

Alderman Shea stated before the renovations...when we had security here we had somebody here because I was on the Board before it was renovated and after it was renovated...was that part of your responsibility?

City Clerk Bernier reiterated before...I don't think there were security guards before. There was no security.

Alderman Shea stated the security of this building whether there was a security guard or not were you responsible for it?

City Clerk Bernier replied no.

Alderman Shea stated you were...in other words you...

Chairman Gatsas interjected he said the answer was no.

Alderman Shea stated no you were not responsible.

City Clerk Bernier stated no...we locked the doors when we left.

Alderman Shea asked well who did that?

City Clerk Bernier stated that was the City Clerk's office.

Alderman Shea stated okay you did, right.

City Clerk Bernier stated yes.

Alderman Shea stated so what happened is because more money was added to this building in terms of renovating it and what you're saying is your duties although the same were expanded because now we had a security guard is that correct?

City Clerk Bernier replied yes.

Alderman Shea stated so that is the difference between before and after because as it says here the Public Works Director and the City Clerk oversee the repair, maintenance, capital improvements, operation and cleaning of the City Hall complex. In other words, who hires the persons responsible...does the Public Works person hire them or you?

City Clerk Bernier replied first of all it's privatized...it's under ServiceMaster or Aramark now but the responsibility does come to the City Clerk's office when the job is not done properly so we do work with them directly.

Alderman Shea asked who cleaned this building before it was renovated?

City Clerk Bernier replied it was city employees.

Alderman Shea asked who was responsible for them doing that work?

City Clerk Bernier replied it was Dick Houle.

Alderman Shea stated you weren't responsible.

City Clerk Bernier stated no.

Alderman Shea stated you didn't have anything to do with them at all.

City Clerk Bernier stated no.

Alderman Shea stated if it were not maintained you didn't bother with it he did.

City Clerk Bernier stated we would send a letter or whatever to the person...it was really under Building Maintenance/Facilities Division.

Chairman Gatsas stated let me ask you a question...you have the ability to go to the Department of Labor is my understanding, is that correct, if you have a grievance.

City Clerk Bernier stated yes.

Chairman Gatsas stated in the Department of Labor you have an opportunity to go back how many years.

City Clerk Bernier stated three years, I think.

Chairman Gatsas stated you're also entitled to legal fees.

City Clerk Bernier stated I would assume so.

Chairman Gatsas stated and you're probably entitled to double damages if my memory serves me correct.

City Clerk Bernier stated I am not familiar with the laws.

Chairman Gatsas stated if memory serves me correct you're entitled to double damages and I guess...we don't have a City Solicitor here so I can't get that answer...is there a reason and I'll give it to the Clerk...I will request that whenever the Human Resources Committee meets that we have a City Solicitor here to make sure that we address...if there are labor issues that they can certainly forward the information on to us. So, if the City Clerk will get that out to him tomorrow and tell him that from now on whenever we meet that somebody be here.

Clerk Normand replied we can do that.

Chairman Gatsas stated I guess my question is you can't give me that answer but memory serves me correct and I guess I would say that obviously if you forgot you have the opportunity to remember the Department of Labor. So, if this committee...we've heard the hearing, I think you've all been apprised of what's there, I guess I'll be looking for a motion.

Alderman Garrity moved to receive and file the communication from the City Clerk. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Duval duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Shea asked did you vote, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Gatsas replied no I think the Chairman only has to vote in a tie.

Alderman Shea stated no the Chairman has to express his vote.

Chairman Gatsas stated I'm the Chairman of the committee and I guess it's my ruling that you don't have to.

Alderman Shea stated no we made a new ruling I believe that all persons in the committees have to vote.

Chairman Gatsas stated really.

Alderman Shea stated we made a new ruling, I believe, that all persons in the committee have to vote.

Alderman Garrity asked is that an ordinance?

Alderman Shea stated that's true.

Chairman Gatsas stated I don't remember that vote. I guess in this committee the Chairman as far as I understand it the Chairman only votes in case of a tie.

Alderman Shea reiterated no that is not correct. We were cautioned that everyone has to vote.

Chairman Gatsas stated do you want to take that up at the full Board, Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea stated it already went to the full Board.

Chairman Gatsas stated hold on.

Clerk Normand stated it is my understanding that only in the event of a tie the Chairman votes.

Alderman Shea reiterated no that's not correct we voted. Could we get a ruling from the City Solicitor.

Clerk Normand replied we can do that.

Alderman Garrity stated, Mr. Chairman, just an editorial comment on not having anyone here from legal...common sense would have told you that somebody from the legal department needed to be here.

Chairman Gatsas stated I think we've expressed it, Alderman Garrity, and I think that certainly I will assume that they will adhere to whatever question we ask.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

11. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, requesting to apply ordinance 33.079 (J) Vacations to Paul Borek, Economic Development Director and for Ms. Lamberton as well.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to remove item 11 from the table for discussion.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to receive and file item 11.

8. Communication from Joan Porter, Tax Collector, relating to part-time employees.

This item remained tabled.

9. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, recommending the City Hall Custodian position be reclassified to a new class specification to be called Building and Facilities Maintenance Coordinator from salary grade 8 to 13.

Alderman Duval asked is this an item that would be considered in the Mayor's budget, is this something he would be looking at in terms of whether.

Chairman Gatsas stated I think we can send that recommendation on, we can take it off the table. Let's take it off the table for discussion.

On motion of Alderman Duval, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to remove item 9 from the agenda for discussion.

Chairman Gatsas called upon Ms. Lamberton.

Ms. Lamberton stated this is a standard reclassification, a position questionnaire was filled out, a desk audit was performed, the analysis of the duties and a comparison of these duties to other duties of other city employees in other departments. This would not...as I said earlier you don't want to do reclassifications through the budget process because you will get things that you never dreamed of.

Chairman Gatsas stated I think his question is just a few minutes ago we had heard that that person was working for an independent.

Ms. Lamberton stated no.

Chairman Gatsas stated oh he is now an employee here.

Ms. Lamberton stated before I came here I believe he did work for whoever was contracting with the city for a while but I believe that a position was created for him as the custodian and he came to work for the city as custodian but since that time the duties that have been assigned to that position have grown and his level of responsibility has increased.

Chairman Gatsas asked can you give us a little insight of why this was tabled from the last committee?

Ms. Lamberton replied if my memory serves me correctly Alderman Garrity wanted to table it so that the new Mayor could look at it.

Alderman Garrity stated obviously it's going to have a fiscal impact and that's my point...a Grade 8 to a Grade 13...do I think it's warranted, probably yes but I think the Mayor's office should probably look at it.

Chairman Gatsas asked is there a financial implication because I don't see one.

Ms. Lamberton replied yes there is I have it here for you. A reclassification of this position with the current incumbent would go...the incumbent now is a Grade 8, Step 13. If this position going through the whole process of reclassification by March 7<sup>th</sup> which is a Tuesday it would be \$23.60 a week or \$377.60 for the balance of this fiscal year. As of July 1<sup>st</sup> for the next fiscal year 2007 it would be \$41.34 a week or \$2,100 for the balance of fiscal year 2007...that's what the fiscal impact would be and that includes the 2% COLA that the Board has already approved to be given to the employees during the summer.

Alderman Shea asked whose department does that come out of?

Ms. Lamberton replied it comes out of the City Clerk's office.

Chairman Gatsas asked is there any discussion?

Alderman Duval replied just an observation if I might. I just want to make sure that the positions of our hourly workers...those that are doing what I think the laborious duties in and around our buildings are considered fairly and judiciously. I don't know the history, I don't know as to why this was proposed...when it was...obviously, it came before I got here but I just want to make sure that they're not overlooked, so whichever department is responsible for representing custodial positions that they are instructed to take that into consideration during their budget presentations.

Chairman Gatsas stated just so that you understand, Alderman, this isn't the final say. We may approve this as a committee, it still must go before the full Board.



Alderman Pinard moved to recommend approval of the reclassification of the City Hall Custodian position. This person is here early in the morning, at night...he's out there with a shovel, he's out there will salt...he is well-respected by all employees, people like him are very hard to get and I recommend we go along with this. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. So often people that are at the bottom really don't get recognized and although it was in my committee for quite a while obviously we have to check with the City Clerk to see if he would have \$377.60 in his present budget for this '06 year and as Alderman Pinard has explained he is well-deserving of it.

Chairman Gatsas stated the question was...the reclassification of an employee from Grade 8 to 13 would amount to \$377.60 additional funding, is that within your budget right now?

City Clerk Bernier replied yes.

Chairman Gatsas called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

10. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, requesting the establishment of a new class specification Painter, salary grade 13, and the establishment of two painter positions.

Chairman Gatsas asked is there a reason why we don't want to take item 10 off the table for discussion.

Ms. Lamberton replied I have an answer for that.

Chairman Gatsas stated because we are in our first meeting I know that Joan Porter had asked me to leave item 8 on the table until our next meeting because she had prior commitments and she could appear to speak on that.

Alderman Shea asked do you want to take item 10 off the table.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to remove item 10 from the table for discussion.

Ms. Lamberton stated the Highway Department specifically Kevin Sheppard on behalf of Frank Thomas, asked that you leave it on the table until the next meeting.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to retable item 10 at the request of the Public Works Director.

There being no further business to come before the committee, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee